

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the thorough examination of the present application as evidenced by the Office Action. In particular, the Applicant appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 11-13 and 23. Applicant submits this case is in form for allowance for the reasons discussed below.

Correct Filing Date:

Applicant notes the Office Action indicates March 18, 2004 as a filing date for this application. The above date of March 17, 2004 is the correct filing date, for the reasons stated in Applicant's Petition to Accord the Proper Filing Date, mailed October 8, 2004. Applicant requests correction of the filing date in the USPTO records.

The Section 112 Rejections:

Claims 8-13 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite based on use of the term "at about" in Claims 8, 9, 20 and 21. Office Action, p. 2. Applicant submits that words of degree, such as "about," have long been accepted for use in claim terminology so long as one of ordinary skill in the art would be reasonably apprised of the scope of the claimed invention. *See, e.g. Seattle Box Co. v. Industrial Crat. & Pack. Inc.*, 731 F.2d 818, 221 U.S.P.Q. 568, 573-74 (Fed. Cir. 1984). In fact, a search of the term "about" in the claims field of the USPTO patent database identified a total of **806,112** issued patents (Applicant notes that not all of these patents use the term about in the same manner as in the pending claims). More particularly, the Examiner alleges the "term failed to show if a packet is received exactly at the time frame or not." Office Action, p. 2. The answer to this alleged indefiniteness basis is quite clear, while the packet may be received at the exact frame time and infringe the claims, it need not be as long as it is about the same frame time in the context of generally understood standards for ad hoc network communication timing and the accuracy of the same and design tolerance of devices used in ad hoc network communications. As such, one of skill in the art would clearly not find the use of the term "about" in these claims to be indefinite.

The Prior Art Rejection:

Claims 14 and 25 stand rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over United States Patent No. 6,571,291 to Chow ("Chow"). Office Action, p. 2. Claims 1-3 and 15-17 stand rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Chow in view of United States Patent No. 6,970,436 to Park et al. ("Park"). Office Action, p. 5. Claims 4-6 and 18 stand rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Chow in view of Park and further in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0090924 to Giaimo et al. ("Giaimo"). Office Action, p. 9. Claims 7 and 19 stand rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Chow and Park in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0179521 to Kim et al. ("Kim"). Office Action, p. 10. Claims 8 and 20 stand rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Chow and Park in view of United States Patent No. 6,628,652 to Chrin et al. ("Chrin"). Office Action, p. 10. Claims 9, 10, 21 and 22 stand rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Chow, Park and Chrin in view of United States Patent No. 6,389,022 to Jeong et al. ("Jeong"). Office Action, p. 13. Finally, Claim 24 stands rejected over Chow and Park in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0185186 to Tsutsumi et al. ("Tsutsumi"). Office Action, p. 15.

Applicant notes Claims 14 and 25 have been canceled above. Accordingly, the anticipation rejections of these claims have been obviated and will not be further addressed herein.

Independent Claims 1 and 15 are Patentable:

In rejecting Claim 1, the Office Action asserts that all recitations of Claim 1 are disclosed by Chow, except for detecting a received packet error in the asynchronous mode. Office Action, p. 6. However, in describing the application of Chow to Claim 1, the basis for the rejection is noteworthy in its failure to ever refer to the recitations of Claim 1, instead just paraphrasing the disclosure of Chow. As accurately described in the rejection, Chow does describe a communication protocol where errors in received packets are identified based on a checksum. More particularly, Chow describes a method for updating an IP checksum in the switching fabric 25 ("also referred to as an internal rules checker (IRC)") of an Ethernet (IEEE 802.3) type packet switched network 10. Chow, Col. 3, lines 8-9, Col. 4, lines 39-67. The IP checksum may be updated because the "time to live field is decremented." Chow, Col. 4, lines 64-67.

Such operations are not described as particular to a selected one of a plurality of different communication modes. In fact, neither the term synchronous nor the term asynchronous appear in Chow based on a search using the USPTO database. Similarly, Park only discusses asynchronous transfer. Furthermore, "time to live" refers to a packet header field "indicating how long the packet should be held." Microsoft Computer Dictionary 3rd Edition, p. 469. Thus, the updating operations in Chow relate to reducing "the memory needed to update the IP checksum" using conventional methods, **not** to detecting or correcting errors in received packets. Instead, Chow appears to suggest its operations are performed on packets that did not generate a checksum error signal, as frames with errors "should be dropped." Chow, Col. 4, lines 44-45.

In contrast, the method as recited in Claim 1 is directed to providing correction only in a synchronous communication mode, not in an asynchronous mode. As described in the background section of the present application:

For example, the BT-1.1 standard provides for supporting a real time application such as voice. In such a case, Bluetooth provides a synchronous link in which the transmissions are scheduled in advance to occur at regular intervals so that a receiver may know when to expect packets for the synchronous link. Dropped packets due to bad header CRC results may adversely affect voice quality in such a real-time application as with, for example, a Bluetooth headset.

Specification, p. 1 line 30 to p. 2, line 2. Thus, some embodiments of the present invention may provide differential handling of packets in the respective modes, which may provide improved performance.

Accordingly, the rejections of independent Claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom should be withdrawn for at least these reasons. Independent Claims 15 is patentable for at least substantially similar reasons based on corresponding recitations therein.

The Dependent Claims:


The dependent claims are patentable at least based on their dependence from respective ones of the independent claims as discussed above. However, various of the dependent claims are also separately patentable. For example, Claims 11-13 and 23 are separately patentable at least for the reasons they are indicated as containing allowable subject matter in the Office Action. Office Action, p. 15. With respect to Claim 3, the Office Action alleges the recited table is disclosed by column 4, lines 40-55 of Chow,

which appear not to even reference a table. Thus, regardless of whether the "checksum and data packet head, both comprise 16-bits," the cited portion of Chow clearly does not disclose the recitations of Claim 3. Office Action, p. 7. Accordingly, Claim 3, and Claims 4-6 depending therefrom, are also separately patentable for at least these reasons. With respect to Claims 7 and 19, the Office Action asserts that column 4, lines 29-55 of Chow disclose discarding packets if a determined destination address does not correspond to the expected destination device address. Office Action, p. 10. However, Applicant cannot find such a discussion or suggestion in the cited portion of Chow. At most, Chow suggests detecting an error in a header, which header may include a destination address. Such a determination does not use any reference to an "expected destination device address." Accordingly, Claims 7 and 19 are also separately patentable for at least these reasons. Claims 9, 10, 21 and 22 are separately patentable for at least similar reasons.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the reference cited in the present rejections does not disclose or suggest the present invention as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections by the Examiner and allowance of all the pending claims and passing this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,


Robert W. Glatz
Registration No.: 36,811

USPTO Customer No. 54414
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec
Post Office Box 37428
Raleigh, North Carolina 27627
Telephone: 919/854-1400
Facsimile: 919/854-1401

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4) to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on October 5, 2007.

Signature: 
Typed or Printed Name of Person Signing Certificate: Carey Gregory

Microsoft Press

Computer Dictionary

Third Edition

Microsoft Press

PUBLISHED BY
Microsoft Press
A Division of Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond, Washington 98052-6399

Copyright © 1997 by Microsoft Corporation

All rights reserved. No part of the contents of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means without the written permission of the publisher.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary. -- 3rd ed.

p. cm.

ISBN 1-57231-446-X

1. Computers--Dictionaries. 2. Microcomputers--Dictionaries.

I. Microsoft Press.

QA76.15.M54 1997

004'.03--dc21

97-15489

CIP

Printed and bound in the United States of America.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 QMQM 2 1 0 9 8 7

Distributed to the book trade in Canada by Macmillan of Canada, a division of Canada Publishing Corporation.

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Microsoft Press books are available through booksellers and distributors worldwide. For further information about international editions, contact your local Microsoft Corporation office. Or contact Microsoft Press International directly at fax (425) 936-7329.


Macintosh, Power Macintosh, QuickTime, and TrueType are registered trademarks of Apple Computer, Inc. Intel is a registered trademark of Intel Corporation. DirectInput, DirectX, Microsoft, Microsoft Press, MS-DOS, Visual Basic, Visual C++, Win32, Win32s, Windows, Windows NT, and XENIX are registered trademarks and ActiveMovie, ActiveX, and Visual J++ are trademarks of Microsoft Corporation. Java is a trademark of Sun Microsystems, Inc. Other product and company names mentioned herein may be the trademarks of their respective owners.

Acquisitions Editor: Kim Fryer

Project Editor: Maureen Williams Zimmerman, Anne Taussig

Technical Editors: Dail Magee Jr., Gary Nelson, Jean Ross, Jim Fuchs, John Conrow, Kurt Meyer, Robert Lyon, Roslyn Lutsch

graphic image. See the illustration. **3.** In an environment with multiple windows, to rearrange and resize all open windows so that they appear fully on the screen without any overlap.



Tile.

time and date \tīm` ənd dāt` \ *n.* In computing, the timekeeping and datekeeping functions maintained by the computer's operating system, used most visibly as a means of "stamping" files with the date and time of creation or last revision.

time-division multiplexing \tīm`dā-vīzh-ən mul`ti-pleks-ēng` \ *n.* A form of multiplexing in which transmission time is broken into segments, each of which carries one element of one signal. *See also* statistical multiplexer. *Compare* FDM.

time out or **timeout** or **time-out** \tīm out` \ *n.* An event that indicates that a predetermined amount of time has elapsed without some other expected event taking place. The time-out event is used to interrupt the process that had been waiting for the other expected event. For example, a dial-up remote system might allow the user 60 seconds to log in after making a connection. If the user fails to enter a valid login name and password within this time, the computer breaks the connection, thus protecting itself against crackers as well as freeing a phone line that may have gone dead.

timer \tī`mər` \ *n.* A register (high-speed memory circuit) or a special circuit, chip, or software routine used to measure time intervals. A timer is not the same as the system clock, although its pulses can be derived from the system clock frequency. *See also* time and date. *Compare* clock (definition 1), clock/calendar.

time-sharing \tīm`shâr-ēng` \ *n.* The use of a computer system by more than one individual at the same time. Time-sharing runs separate programs concurrently by interleaving portions of processing time allotted to each program (user). *See also* quantum (definition 2), time slice.

time slice \tīm` slīs` \ *n.* A brief period of time during which a particular task is given control of the microprocessor in a time-sharing multitasking environment. *See also* multitasking, preemptive multitasking. *Compare* quantum (definition 2).

time-slice multitasking \tīm`slīs mul`tē-ta-skēng, mul`ti-ta-skēng` \ *n.* *See* preemptive multitasking.

Time to Live \tīm` tō liv` \ *n.* A header field for a packet sent over the Internet indicating how long the packet should be held. *Acronym:* TTL (T`T-L`). *See also* header (definition 2), packet (definition 1).

timing signals \tīm`mēng sig`nəlz` \ *n.* **1.** Any of several types of signals used to coordinate activities within a computer system. **2.** A signal used to coordinate data transfer operations.

tiny model \tī`nē mod`əl` \ *n.* A memory model in the Intel 80x86 processor family. The tiny model allows a combined total of only 64 kilobytes (KB) for code and for data. *See also* 8086, memory model.

title bar \tī`tl bār` \ *n.* In a graphical user interface, a horizontal space at the top of a window that contains the name of the window. Most title bars also contain boxes or buttons for closing and resizing the window. Clicking on the title bar allows the user to move the entire window.

.tj \dot`T-J` \ *n.* On the Internet, the major geographic domain specifying that an address is located in Tajikistan.

.tk \dot`T-K` \ *n.* On the Internet, the major geographic domain specifying that an address is located in Tokelau.

TLA \T`L-A` \ *n.* Acronym for **three-letter acronym**. An ironic term, usually used in jest on the Internet in e-mail, newsgroups, and other online forums, referring to the large number of acronyms in computer terminology, particularly those consisting of three letters.

.tm \dot`T-M` \ *n.* On the Internet, the major geographic domain specifying that an address is located in Turkmenistan.

TMS34010 \T-M-S`thrē`-fôr-ō`wən-ō` \ *n.* *See* 34010, 34020.